

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action mailed May 16, 2007 (hereinafter, "Office Action"), the Examiner objected to the title; rejected claims 35-108 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,470; and rejected claim 105 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

By this response, Applicants hereby amend claim 105. Claims 15-34 have been previously canceled, and non-elected claims 109-122 have been withdrawn. Claims 35-108 are currently pending.

Based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and the judicially-created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting, and request timely allowance of claims 35-108.

I. Objection to Title

The Examiner objected to the title, stating that "[t]he title of the invention is not descriptive." Office Action, p. 2. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection to the title. However, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended the title to recite "DEVICES AND METHODS FOR PROCESSING DIGITAL IMAGE DATA COMPATIBLE WITH A TELEVISION RECEIVER." This title is more descriptive as required by the Examiner.

II. Obvious-Type Double Patenting Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 35-108 under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,470. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer disclaiming the terminal part of the term of any

patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. §§ 154 to 156 and 173, as presently shortened by any terminal disclaimer, of U.S. Patent No. 6,614,470.

Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 35-108 be withdrawn, and the claims allowed.

III. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 105 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being “directed to non-statutory subject matter.” Office Action, p. 5. However, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 105 to recite a “computer program product, tangibly embodied on a machine-readable storage device” Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 7, lines 15-16. In light of the foregoing amendment, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 105 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and timely allowance of this claim.

IV. Conclusion


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of claims 35-108.

The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: 
Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743

Dated: August 16, 2007

Attachment: Terminal Disclaimer